UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/813,792	03/30/2004	Yasushi Sasagawa	FUJO 21.086	5194	
	7590 01/28/200 CHIN ROSENMAN LI	EXAMINER			
575 MADISON	· · — - · <del>-</del> —	JAIN, RAJ K			
NEW YORK, N	NY 10022-2383		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2416		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/813,792	SASAGAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
RAJ JAIN			

	RAJ JAIN	2416						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	THE REPLY FILED <u>09 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the proposed in the present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the present additional claims.</li> </ul>	sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co		PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allenged non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t		_					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	planation of					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•						
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowand	ce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:								
	/RAJ JAIN/ Examiner, Art Unit 2416							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends the newly added features to claims 1, 11, 34 and 36 are enabled to one of odinary skill in the art.

Examiner disagrees, The specifications fails to disclose "in place of an arriving control packet to a processing unit" and " thereby preventing the processing unit from re-configuring a communication route of a spanning tree protocol." This in itself constitutes new matter which by way of right can not be added to the specifications and based on Applicants cited portions and explainations, Examiner asserts and maintains that one skilled in the art can not reasonably intrepret the cited portions to be same as claimed limitations above, for example where in the cited portions does it say that "a control device autonomously transferring the control packet stored in the buffer device in place of an arriving control packet (emphasis added), thus with that said the rejection to claims 1, 11, 34 and 36 is correct and therefore sustained.

With respect to claims 1, 11, 13, 20, 34 and 36, Applicant contends Hirst fails to disclose "in place of an arriving control packet to a processing unit" and " thereby preventing the processing unit from re-configuring a communication route of a spanning tree protocol." This contention is most based on above reasoning since the specification fails to explicitly describe subject limitation.